THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE RAMESH RANGANATHAN

W.P.No. 10253 OF 1996

Date: 22.01.2007

Between: K. Bhagavan Sarma.

…. Petitioner

and

The Chairman, Shramik Vidyapeeth, Visakhapatnam and three others.

… Respondents.

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE RAMESH RANGANATHAN

W.P.No. 10253 OF 1996

O R D E R:

Pursuant to an advertisement issued in Andhra Bhoomi, a Telugu news paper dated 12.04.1996, inviting applications for appointment to the post of Programme officer in Shramik Vidyapeeths, the petitioner submitted his application. The third respondent issued a call letter on 24.05.1996 calling upon the petitioner to attend interview/test on 05.06.1996. According to the petitioner, the advertisement dated 12.04.1996 granted relaxation, in favour of candidates working in the Shramik Vidyapeeth, with regards the age limit and the special exemptions to be applied. The petitioner would contend that the very appointment of such candidates, through the back door, is arbitrary and illegal and the subsequent grant of relaxation of age and other special exemptions in their favour are also illegal. While the affidavit merely makes a mention of the advertisement dated 12.04.1996 and questions the age limit and special exemptions granted in favour of in-service candidates as stipulated therein, the petitioner has not even to chosen to file a copy of the advertisement before this Court. Grant of age relaxation to in service candidates to enable them to compete along with other candidates, who appear for direct recruitment, cannot be faulted. Except for vague allegations of other special exemptions being granted in their favour, nothing has been stated in the affidavit as what are the special exemptions which in service candidates were given the benefit of. Further, appointment of in-service candidates cannot

be subjected to challenge in their absence or their being arrayed as respondents in the writ petition. In the absence of a copy of the advertisement being filed, the self-serving statements in the affidavit filed in support of the writ petition cannot be taken note of. In the absence of even minimum required particulars, I see no reason to entertain this writ petition. The writ petition fails and is accordingly dismissed.

_____

Date: 22.01.2007 RAMESH RANGANATHAN, J

MRKR